

REMARKS

Claims 10-19 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant editorially amends claims 10, 13-16, and 19 to cure minor informalities. The amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. In addition, Applicant adds claims 20-23, which are clearly supported throughout the specification *e.g.*, pages 51-56.

I. Preliminary Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim to foreign priority and for indicating receipt of the certified copy of the Priority Document.

Applicant further thanks the Examiner for returning the initialed forms PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on January 3, 2006, December 7, 2006, and October 3, 2007. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for indicating acceptance of the drawing figures filed on January 3, 2006.

Applicant further thanks the Examiner for noting a reference discussed in the specification (page 46, lines 6 and 7) but omitted from the Information Disclosure Statement. Applicant encloses herewith an Information Disclosure Statement in which this reference is properly identified.

II. Summary of the Office Action

Claims 13 and 19 are objected to for minor informalities. Claims 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, claims 10-12 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 13 and 19 contain allowable subject matter.

III. Claim Objections

Claims 13 and 19 are objected to because of informalities. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw these objections in view of the self-explanatory claim amendments being made herewith.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection in view of the self-explanatory claim amendments being made herewith.

V. Prior Art Rejections

Claims 10-12 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,219,055 to Bhargava et al. (hereinafter “Bhargava”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,373 to Guenther et al. (hereinafter “Guenther”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0195642 to Ragnini (hereinafter “Ragnini”). Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw these grounds of rejection in view of the following comments.

Independent claim 10 *inter alia* recites: “inserting machining shape information corresponding to a specified shape element required for forming the machining unit data with respect to the machining shape model displayed in the model display section in a cursor position specified in the editor section.” For example, a machining shape tree, a program tree, an editor section, and a model display section are provided. In an exemplary embodiment of the present invention, a shape element is selected in a 3-D display section (a model display section). The machining shape information corresponding to the specified shape element is inserted in the editing section where the cursor is positioned in the editing section. The above provided

description of an exemplary embodiment is provided only to help the Examiner further understand the unique features of claim 10 and is not provided to limit the scope of the claims in any way.

The Examiner contends that claim 10 is directed to an automatic programming method and is obvious in view of Bhargava, Guenther, and Ragnini. Specifically, the Examiner contends that Bhargava discloses the above-quoted unique features of claim 10. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that Bhargava does not disclose or suggest inserting the machine shape information in the editor section in a place specified by the cursor position in the editor section and inserting machine shape information that corresponds to the machining shape model displayed in the model display section.

Bhargava simply discloses a forming tool for manipulating a computer model including mechanisms for allowing a user to define a forming tool for creating a form feature of the model. Characteristics of the forming tool may be defined so that the forming tool may be reused without the need to redefine its characteristics (*see Abstract*). Specifically, Bhargava discloses a window 96 being provided in response to the user selecting the Properties option of the pop-up menu 80 shown in FIG. 6. The properties shown in the window 96 are properties of the Rear Cut feature. Just as with the window 84 of FIG. 8, the user can modify items in the window 96 using the mouse 34 and/or the keyboard 33. Note that different types of features have different types of properties and so would probably provide a window different than the window 96 shown in FIG. 10. The specific properties that are shown for each type of feature are a design choice based on a variety of functional factors familiar to one of ordinary skill in the art (col. 9, lines 44 to 55).

Bhargava, however, fails to disclose or suggest inserting machining shape information. Bhargava simply discloses editing/modifying feature properties in window 96. In addition, the feature properties that are modified include feature name, date of creation and a person who created it (Fig. 10). Bhargava does not disclose or suggest inserting machining shape information. In Bhargava, only the name of the unit can be modified. In short, Bhargava does not disclose or suggest inserting as opposed to simply modifying machining shape information that corresponds to a specified shape element and inserting the machine shape information that corresponds to the machining shape model displayed in the model display section as opposed to just changing the name of the shape element. Guenther and Ragnini do not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Bhargava.

Therefore, “inserting machining shape information corresponding to a specified shape element required for forming the machining unit data with respect to the machining shape model displayed in the model display section in a cursor position specified in the editor section,” as set forth in claim 10 is not suggested by the combined disclosures of Bhargava, Guenther, and Ragnini. Together, the combined teachings of these references would not have and could have led an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to achieve the unique features of claim 10. For at least these exemplary reasons, claim 10 is patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 10. Claims 11 and 12 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 10.

Independent claim 14 *inter alia* recites: “displaying a machining unit corresponding to a cursor position in the editor section and in any one of the product model and the work model or both displayed in the model display section in highlighted manner.” That is, in an exemplary,

non-limiting embodiment of the present invention, a machining unit that corresponds to the cursor position in the editing section is displayed in the model display section as highlighted.

The detailed action of the Office Action fails to address these unique features of claim 14. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record do not disclose or even remotely suggest highlighting a machining unit in the modeling portion 62 (alleged model display section, *see page 4 of the Office Action*) corresponding to a cursor position in the feature properties section 96 (alleged edit section, *see page 5 of the Office Action*). For at least these exemplary reasons, claim 14 is patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 14.

Claims 15 and 16 recite features that are somewhat similar to, although not necessary coextensive with, the features set forth in claim 10 and argued above. For at least analogous reasons, therefore, claims 15 and 16 are patentable over Bhargava, Guenther, and Ragnini. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claims 15 and 16. Claims 17 and 18 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 16.

VI. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 13 and 19 are allowable. Applicant has remedied the minor informalities noted by the Examiner and respectfully requests that the Examiner now allow claims 13 and 19. Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's reasons for allowance.

VII. New Claims

In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claims 20-23 which are patentable by virtue of their dependency and for additional features set forth therein.

VIII. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nataliya Dvorson/
Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 1, 2008